



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,140	02/05/2001	Tetsujiro Kondo	450101-02537	1959
20999	7590	03/24/2005		
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			EXAMINER WHIPKEY, JASON T	
			ART UNIT 2612	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/700,140

Applicant(s)

KONDO ET AL.

Examiner

Jason T. Whipkey

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant's amendment to the specification is approved.

Claim Objections

2. Applicant's amendment to the claims to overcome the objections is approved. The corresponding objections are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments (see page 11 of the remarks filed September 13, 2004) with respect to the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of Martin.

For this reason, this Office action is non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2612

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll (U.S. Patent No. 6,593,969) in view of Martin (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,131).

Regarding **claims 1, 4, and 14**, Driscoll discloses a panoramic camera and its associated processing device. The system captures a distorted annular image, as shown in Figure 3A (a “distorted picture image”), into the corrected image shown in Figure 3B.

The system is comprised of the components shown in Figure 13A, including panoramic camera system 1205 (“image pick-up means”), a network (“communication means”), and computers (“a picture image display unit”) connected to the network (column 10, line 64, through column 11, line 3). Digitized annular images captured by panoramic camera system 1205 are stored in annular video storage system 1230 (“memory means”) (column 10, lines 42-43).

A computer user makes a request using the GUI shown in Figure 13B, wherein a desired viewing area is requested by moving locator window 1315 (column 11, lines 12-15). The requested viewing area is transmitted by the network to user input processing routines 1250 and 1253 ("selector means") (column 11, lines 19-20). User input processing routines 1250 and 1253 instruct annular to video conversion units 1240 and 1243 ("picture image conversion means") to produce and output corrected images of the selected area to the computer (column 11, lines 19-24).

Driscoll is silent with regard to converting the distorted image into a high-quality image.

Martin discloses a camera with a fisheye lens used for surveillance. Image transform processor 24 in Figure 2 corrects image distortion and increases the resolution of the image (column 8, lines 19-24 and 63-65).

An advantage of increasing a resolution of an outputted image is that the image may be displayed on a high-definition monitor without external upconversion. For this reason, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to have Driscoll's camera increase image quality prior to outputting the image signal.

Claim 5 may be treated like claim 1. Additionally, Driscoll teaches that image processing is performed on computer system 1200 (column 10, line 34). It is inherent that computers perform processing using instructions stored in some form.

Claims 12 and 13 may be treated like claim 1. Additionally, it is inherent that a computer connected to a network has some sort of hardware interface to that network ("second communication means").

Art Unit: 2612

7. Claims 2, 6-8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll in view of Martin and further in view of Adams (U.S. Patent No. 5,652,621).

Claim 2 may be treated like claim 1. However, Driscoll is silent with regard to selecting distorted portions of the image for correction through classification adaptive processing.

Adams discloses a digital camera system that classifies pixels based on their properties and selects a type of processing to be performed on each pixel based on that classification (column 4, lines 37-44). An advantage to performing processing in this manner is that unnecessary processing is avoided. For this reason, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to have Driscoll's system classify pixels to determine whether distortion-corrective processing is necessary prior to performing such processing.

Regarding **claims 6, 10, and 11**, Driscoll discloses panoramic camera and its associated processing device. The system captures a distorted annular image, as shown in Figure 3A ("picture data having distortion"), into the corrected image shown in Figure 3B.

The system is comprised of the components shown in Figure 13A, including a network and computers connected to the network (column 10, line 64, through column 11, line 3). Digitized annular images captured by panoramic camera system 1205 are stored in annular video storage system 1230 (column 10, lines 42-43).

A computer user makes a request using the GUI shown in Figure 13B, wherein a desired viewing area is requested by moving locator window 1315 (column 11, lines 12-15). The requested viewing area ("predetermined unit[s] of picture data" of a "feature") is transmitted by the network to user input processing routines 1250 and 1253 ("extraction means") (column 11, lines 19-20). User input processing routines 1250 and 1253 instruct annular to video conversion

Art Unit: 2612

units 1240 and 1243 (“picture image conversion means”) to produce and output corrected images of the selected area to the computer (column 11, lines 19-24).

Driscoll is silent with regard to selecting distorted portions of the image for correction through classification of pixels.

Adams discloses a digital camera system that classifies pixels based on their properties and selects a type of processing to be performed on each pixel based on that classification (column 4, lines 37-44). An advantage to performing processing in this manner is that unnecessary processing is avoided. For this reason, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to have Driscoll’s system classify pixels to determine whether distortion-corrective processing is necessary prior to performing such processing.

Regarding **claim 7**, Driscoll’s system includes panoramic camera system 1205 (“image pick-up means”).

Regarding **claim 8**, Adams discloses a digital camera system that classifies pixels based on their properties and selects a type of processing to be performed on each pixel based on that classification (column 4, lines 37-44).

8. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll in view of Martin and Adams and further in view of Kondo (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,138).

Claims 3 and 9 may be treated like claims 2 and 6, respectively. However, Adams is silent with regard to performing adaptive dynamic range coding.

Kondo discloses an image signal processing apparatus that performs ADRC encoding on captured image data using ADRC encoder 8 (column 5, lines 28-30). An advantage to

Art Unit: 2612

performing ADRC encoding on pixels prior to classifying them for processing is that the number of bits necessary to represent the image data is reduced, thus reducing the amount of processing necessary to manipulate the data. For this reason, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to have Adams's system perform ADRC coding on the image data prior to performing any processing.


Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Whipkey, whose telephone number is (571) 272-7321. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. eastern standard time, alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached at (571) 272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JTW
JTW
March 8, 2005


WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2500